



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,486	03/27/2001	Daniel Lynn	F-5235 CIP DIV CIP2	2286

7590

07/31/2003

Michael C. Mayo
Baxter Healthcare Corporation
Route 120 and Wilson Rd.
Round Lake, IL 60073

EXAMINER

BIANCO, PATRICIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3762

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/818,486

Applicant(s)

LYNN ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia M Bianco

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,9,11,14 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,10,12,13 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action*.

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species I in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the species grouping should have included figure 16 and that claims 1, 2, 5 & 18 are generic. This is found to be persuasive. The species now includes figures 9, 14, 15, & 16-19. After reconsideration of the claims, it is agreed that claims 1, 2, 5 & 8 are generic.

2. Claims 4, 9, 11, 14 & 15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6.

Please note that claim 15, elected by applicant to be readable on Species I, has been withdrawn since it is dependent from claim 14, which does not read on the elected species.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration in a continuation-in-part application filed under the conditions specified in 35 U.S.C. 120 which

Art Unit: 3762

discloses and claims subject matter in addition to that disclosed in the prior co-pending application, acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56 which became available between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of the continuation-in-part application.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 34, line 21, applicant states that reference number 130 is shown on figure 15, however, it is not. It is shown on figure 14

Appropriate correction is required.

5. Applicant has indicated co-pending applications in the first paragraph of the specification. The first page of the specification should be updated to clarify the status of all related applications noted in the first paragraph of the specification. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. _____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Reference numbers **230** referenced on page 34, line 21

Art Unit: 3762

Reference numbers **244 & 246** referenced on page 37, line 12-page 38, line 5

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

Reference numbers **44 & 48** shown on figure 17

Reference numbers **30, 44 & 46** shown on figures 18 & 19

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12 & 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldhaber et al. (5,269,946). Goldhaber et al. (hereafter Goldhaber) discloses a system and method for collecting, separating and filtering whole blood

Art Unit: 3762

components into storage containers. The system includes 4 bags (16/28/26/34) or containers seen to be equivalent to applicant's first, second, transfer and auxiliary containers. The containers are integrally coupled to one another by tubing (29/30/32) to form a blood processing set. The system further includes a filter (40) in-line with one of the containers to remove undesired components from the separated blood, such as white blood cells. With respect to the bags or containers being "sized and configured to hold" their respective units of blood, first and second components, and additive solutions, the limitations that the containers to hold specific solutions or separated blood components has been treated as intended use recitations. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 3762

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 3, 6, 13, 16 & 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldhaber ('964) in view of Pall et al. (5,217,627). Goldhaber discloses the invention substantially as claimed, see rejection supra. Goldhaber, however, fails to disclose specifically that the system includes a second filter and that the auxiliary container is in communication with the first container.

Pall et al. (hereafter Pall) discloses a system and method for processing and filtering whole blood. The system includes a first container (11), two filters (13/17) a second container (41), a third container (18, and optionally a fourth container (42) connected with tubing as shown in figures 1 and 2. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Goldhaber to include a second filter as taught by Pall in communication with one of the secondary containers to ensure that the component stored in said container is free of undesirable components, such as leukocytes. With respect to the location of the filters and auxiliary container, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the auxiliary container in communication with the first container &/or the second container, and to arrange the second filter as required in claims 6 and 17, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70

Art Unit: 3762

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning the rejections contained within this communication or earlier communications should be directed to examiner Tricia Bianco whose telephone number is (703) 305-1482. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Fridays, alternating Fridays off, from 9:00 AM until 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on (703) 308-5181. The official fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and for After Final communications (703) 872-9303.

Tricia Bianco
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3762

pmb 
July 28th, 2003